



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,714	10/10/2000	Jere F. Irwin	IR3 -012	4661

21567 7590 11/25/2002

WELLS ST. JOHN ROBERTS GREGORY & MATKIN P.S.  
601 W. FIRST AVENUE  
SUITE 1300  
SPOKANE, WA 99201-3828

EXAMINER

CHOI, STEPHEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/686,714

Applicant(s)

IRWIN, JERE F.

Examiner

Stephen Choi

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 23-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 23-31 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Group I. Claims 1, 8, 10 are, drawn to a trim press containing a punch and a die, classified in class 83, subclass 209.
  - Group II. Claims 2-7 and 9 are, drawn to a trim press containing a control circuitry, classified in class 83, subclass 367.
  - Group III. Claims 11-18 are, drawn to an article conveying, guiding, and locating device, classified in class 226, subclass 120.
  - Group IV. Claims 23-25 are, drawn to a trim press containing a knock lever mechanism, classified in class 83, subclass 416.
  - Group V. Claims 29-31 are, drawn to an article centering severing device containing a knock lever mechanism, classified in class 226, subclass 154.
  - Group VI. Claims 26-28 are, drawn to an article conveying, guiding, and locating device containing a knock lever mechanism, classified in class 226, subclass 134.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions of group II and groups I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if there is evidence that the combination does not rely on the subcombination for patentability. See MPEP 806.05 (c), example 3. For example, group I is evidence that the combination of group II does

Art Unit: 3724

not rely on the controller of group III for patentability, and conversely, group III is evidence that the combination of group II does not rely on the punch and die of group I for patentability.

3. Inventions of groups I and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination of group I does not require the controller of group III for patentability. The subcombination has separate utility such as a device not having a punch and a die as set forth in group I.

4. Inventions of groups I and V-VI are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination of group I does not require the knock lever mechanism of groups V-VI for patentability. The subcombination has separate utility such as a device not having a punch and a die as set forth in group I.

5. Inventions II and IV-V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, inventions of groups IV-V have separate utility such as a device not requiring a control circuitry as set forth in group II. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
6. Inventions III and IV-V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, inventions of groups IV-V have separate utility such as a device not requiring a controller as set forth in group III. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
7. Inventions of group IV and groups I and V are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if there is evidence that the combination does not rely on the subcombination for patentability. See MPEP 806.05 (c), example 3. For example, group I is evidence that the combination of group IV does not rely on the knock lever mechanism of group V for patentability, and conversely, group V is evidence that the combination of group IV does not rely on the punch and die of group I for patentability.
8. Inventions of group VI and groups II and V are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if there is evidence that the combination does not rely on the subcombination for patentability. See MPEP 806.05 (c), example 3. For example, group II is evidence that the combination of group VI does not rely on the knock lever mechanism of group V for patentability, and conversely,

Art Unit: 3724

group V is evidence that the combination of group VI does not rely on the control circuitry of group II for patentability.

9. Inventions IV and VI are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention of group VI has separate utility such as a device not requiring a stationary platen carrying a die as set forth in group IV. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

10. Inventions of group VI and groups III and V are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if there is evidence that the combination does not rely on the subcombination for patentability. See MPEP 806.05 (c), example 3. For example, group III is evidence that the combination of group VI does not rely on the knock lever mechanism of group V for patentability, and conversely, group III is evidence that the combination of group VI does not rely on the controller of group III for patentability.

11. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

12. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Art Unit: 3724

examiner should be directed to S. Choi whose telephone number is 703-306-4523. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday between 9am and 5pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

SC

November 22, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen Choi". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Stephen" and last name "Choi" clearly distinguishable.

Stephen Choi

Patent Examiner